

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

UNITHERM FOOD SYSTEMS, INC., )  
a Illinois corporation; and )  
JENNIE-O FOODS, INC., a )  
Minnesota corporation, )

Plaintiffs, )

-vs- )

No. CIV-01-347-C )

SWIFT-ECKRICH, INC., d/b/a, )  
CONAGRA REFRIGERATED FOODS, a )  
Delaware corporation, )

Defendant. )

COPY

VIDEO DEPOSITION OF ARNOLD S. MIKELBERG

TAKEN ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS

IN OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA

ON SEPTEMBER 7, 2001

-----  
REPORTED BY: JENNI L. GUNTER, CSR  
DODSON COURT REPORTING, INC.  
POST OFFICE BOX 892560  
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA 73189  
(405) 616-DEPO (3376)

EXHIBIT I

PTO-003252

1 demonstrated in Manchester, England?

2 A Yes.

3 Q What -- what did you do in response to  
4 this correspondence from David Howard?

5 A I did nothing.

6 Q What did Mr. Dorfman do, if anything?

7 A I'm sure he talked to David about it, but  
8 I wasn't in the meeting at that -- at that  
9 particular stage, that I remember.

10 Q When you saw the process demonstrated in  
11 Manchester what was the pyrolysis agent that was  
12 used?

13 A I couldn't tell you.

14 Q Okay. But some was, some liquid  
15 pyrolysis?

16 A I'm -- I'm -- I'm not sure.

17 Q Okay. What is the -- the word pyrolysis,  
18 I looked it up because I didn't know what it  
19 meant. What does that mean?

20 A It doesn't mean you being paralyzed.  
21 It's an agent that will cling to the product and  
22 help in the coloration of it.

23 Q Maillose, what does that mean to you?

24 A It's a sugar. Maillose is a -- I think a  
25 sugar derivative.

1           Q     And is that used in this process, to your  
2     knowledge?

3           A     I couldn't tell you for sure.

4           Q     Did the brown -- the issue of trials on  
5     browning turkey breasts here, and it speaks to the  
6     results were highly successful. 98 percent yield  
7     in 14 minutes. 94 percent. I misspoke.

8           A     Yeah.

9           Q     94 percent yield in 14 minutes.

10                  Is that, the use of the word yield, that  
11     you had talked about earlier?

12           A     Yes.

13           Q     That is you get less shrinkage?

14           A     Yield is the difference between what you  
15     put in and what you got out.

16           Q     So if the process is one where you are  
17     able to brown these turkey breasts with less  
18     shrinkage, that's what we're talking about here?

19           A     That is correct.

20           Q     Did Thorn Apple Valley ever receive any  
21     product that had been done by this process from  
22     Unitherm?

23           A     I believe so.

24           Q     What is Boston Markets?

25           A     Boston Markets is -- it's a franchise

1 as the period of time when you had his equipment?

2 A That is correct. This is not -- this is  
3 before the period of time that we had his  
4 equipment.

5 Q Yes. This is setting it up --

6 A Yes.

7 Q -- as I read it?

8 A Right.

9 Q When it speaks of the smoke process, what  
10 is your understanding of the smoke process?

11 A It's the process of heating the product  
12 and applying smoke so that the product is -- has  
13 the smoked appearance and flavor and smell when it  
14 comes out of the process.

15 Q "Applying smoke," being the liquid  
16 pyrolysis product?

17 A Right.

18 Q It says the objective trial -- or "The  
19 objectives of the trial are as follows: 1)  
20 Unitherm will supply a 2 zone Rapidflow for a  
21 two-week period." Well, there we see what at  
22 least his thought was about how long you'd keep  
23 the trial?

24 A Yes.

25 Q I guess the word Rapidflow applies to

1           A     -- but I don't -- I can't tell you  
2     specific times or when I did.

3           MR. BAILEY: Mr. Schroeder, you've seen  
4     the patent, I take it?

5           MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.

6           MR. BAILEY: Okay.

7           (Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 5 was  
8     marked for identification purposes  
9     and made a part of the record.)

10          Q     (By Mr. Bailey) I hand you what I've  
11     marked as Plaintiffs' Deposition Exhibit 5, which  
12     is United States Patent, number 5,952,027. Date  
13     of patent it says September 14, 1999.

14                 Have you seen this patent?

15          A     Yes, I have.

16          Q     Is this the process that David Howard  
17     demonstrated to you?

18          A     From me reading the patent it's very,  
19     very similar to the process that David Howard  
20     presented to us. Technically, as far as reading a  
21     patent, I feel that I'm not adjudged to say if  
22     it's exactly the same or it isn't. But the  
23     principle of this is very, very similar to what  
24     was presented by David to me.

25          Q     For example, the abstract there on the

1 front page of this document speaks as follows, "A  
2 method of producing a crisp surface and imparting  
3 a uniform golden-brown color to a precooked whole  
4 muscle meat product by coating at least a portion  
5 of the surface of a precooked whole muscle meat  
6 product with a browning liquid pyrolysis product.  
7 The coated surface is then exposed to an energy  
8 source that selectively heats the coated surface  
9 of the whole muscle meat product at a temperature  
10 and for a time sufficient to develop a  
11 golden-brown color on the exposed surface, without  
12 substantially shrinking the precooked whole muscle  
13 meat product."

14 Now, that's --

15 A That's exactly what David presented to us  
16 of what he could -- he could do with his process,  
17 exactly, this portion of it. But when I get into  
18 the technical aspect of it, you know, I can't  
19 compare because I don't have David -- what -- I  
20 don't have David's exact terminologies either.

21 Q Okay.

22 A The only word I don't know is pyrolysis.  
23 Pyrolysis, I've never seen that word. Which means  
24 heat transfer of some kind.

25 Q Yeah. On page 8, if you would turn to

1 ask you a few questions.

2 A Sure.

3 Q Just to review for a moment. The period  
4 of time during which you were employed as  
5 president of Swift-Eckrich was approximately what?

6 A It seems -- as I mentioned before, it  
7 seems like it was '94 or -- actually '95 through  
8 some part of '96.

9 Q So for approximately how many months were  
10 you the president of Armour Swift-Eckrich?

11 A It seems like it was about 13 months, 14  
12 months. But I -- there was an interim situation  
13 where I was president of another small division of  
14 them. But it was somewhere around that time.

15 Q So about 13 months starting sometime in  
16 1995?

17 A Right.

18 Q And prior to the time that you became the  
19 president of Armour Swift-Eckrich you had no  
20 knowledge of what was going on within the company,  
21 correct?

22 A That is correct.

23 Q Now, we've spoken of a man named Prem  
24 Singh. How much time total have you spent with  
25 Mr. Singh?



1 A Total?

2 Q Total.

3 A If you totaled it all up, maybe an hour,  
4 hour and-a-half.

5 Q And Mr. Singh during that hour and-a-half  
6 didn't tell you of everything he'd ever did, did  
7 he?

8 A No. But he never said that -- told me at  
9 any time what he did on -- previous to this.

10 Q All right.

11 A Stated that.

12 Q Now, were you familiar with all the  
13 people -- let me back up for a second.

14 At the time that you were the president  
15 of Swift-Eckrich there was a research and  
16 development department, correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And there were people in that  
19 department --

20 A Yes.

21 Q -- on a full-time basis?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Do you have any idea how many?

24 A I thought a hundred.

25 Q Did you know all those people?

1 A No, I did not.

2 Q Did you know what they all did?

3 A No.

4 Q Did you know what they all had done?

5 A No.

6 Q Was there someone known as Dr. Siad  
7 Hussein (phonetic) working there?

8 A There could have been. I have no idea.

9 Q Certainly if such a person did work there  
10 in the period of '90 to '91 you don't have any  
11 idea what he might have been doing?

12 A I have no idea.

13 Q And you have no idea what Mr. Singh was  
14 doing during that period of time?

15 A No, sir.

16 Q Now, at one point Mr. Howard made a  
17 presentation to Swift-Eckrich, is that right?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And was it your understanding at the time  
20 that the purpose of that demonstration was to sell  
21 Swift-Eckrich an oven?

22 A Not exactly. To sell an oven or the  
23 process?

24 Q To sell a process.

25 A To sell a process and an oven to do that

1 process.

2 Q All right. Now, the oven that Mr. --  
3 first of all, Mr. Howard at the time was  
4 representing Unitherm, and Unitherm was in the  
5 business of selling ovens, correct?

6 A They sold ovens, but they also sold  
7 processes that the ovens were able to -- to do.

8 Q Now, there was a particular type of an  
9 oven which Mr. Howard was attempting to sell  
10 Swift-Eckrich at the time, is that right?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Was that called a Rapidflow oven?

13 A That is correct.

14 Q And were you familiar with the Rapidflow  
15 oven?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Now, the Rapidflow oven could be used to  
18 do a variety of different things in the food  
19 processing industry, is that correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Besides just --

22 A Yes.

23 Q -- browning turkey breasts?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And there was no particular process that

1           Q     I'm sorry. -- Mr. Mikelberg, you're  
2     speaking in terms of the result. But could you  
3     tell me what was different about the process  
4     itself in technical terms?

5           A     No, I can't, because I don't know exactly  
6     what that process was.

7           Q     Now, we talked today about a pyrolysis  
8     product, do you recall that?

9           A     Right, I recall.

10          Q     Do you know what a pyrolysis product is?

11          A     It's something that enhances -- when heat  
12     is applied to it, it enhances the action of the  
13     heat.

14          Q     Now, in the caramelization process that  
15     Swift-Eckrich used before the time that Mr. Howard  
16     got there, wasn't caramel applied?

17          A     Sugars of -- sugars of some kind were  
18     applied.

19          Q     And that did promote the browning of the  
20     process, of the surface, correct?

21          A     Not -- not in the same manner at all.

22          Q     But it did -- it did --

23          A     It tended to bronze the surface of the  
24     product but not in the same manner.

25          Q     Now, is caramel a pyrolysis product?

1           A     I could not tell you that. The first  
2           time I heard the term pyrolysis was today.

3           Q     Now, when Mr. Howard put on his  
4           demonstration, did he use a pyrolysis product?

5           A     I cannot remember.

6           Q     You looked before at the patent, correct?

7           A     That is correct.

8           Q     Do you still have that in front of you?

9           A     Yes.

10          Q     What is the Exhibit Number?

11          A     Exhibit Number 5.

12          Q     All right. Now, Mr. Bailey directed your  
13          attention to the first sentence of the word -- of  
14          the abstract. And you see in there it talks about  
15          a pyrolysis product?

16          A     Right.

17          Q     Now, would it be fair to say that you  
18          don't know whether the process that Mr. Howard  
19          demonstrated complies with that first sentence in  
20          using a pyrolysis product?

21          A     Well, it was explained to me the  
22          pyrolysis product was something to enhance the  
23          browning of it.

24          Q     Well, I think we just said that caramel  
25          enhances the browning, doesn't it?

1 Swift-Eckrich toward that same end prior to the  
2 time that Mr. Howard made this presentation?

3 A I could not make that statement.

4 Q You don't know one way or the other?

5 A I don't -- I certainly do not know.

6 Q Are you familiar with patents?

7 A That's not my area of expertise.

8 Q Do you know how to determine what the  
9 invention that is claimed in a patent is?

10 A No. As I say, I'm not familiar with  
11 patents.

12 Q I'm not suggesting you should be, sir. I  
13 just wanted to know.

14 A I don't ask you to make high thoughts,  
15 and you don't...

16 Q Now, you said that Mr. Singh, Prem Singh,  
17 went to Europe, and while there he visited  
18 Unitherm, is that correct?

19 A Right.

20 Q Was it the purpose of that visit to have  
21 Mr. Singh evaluate the Unitherm oven?

22 A No. He was studying radio frequency  
23 cooking at that time.

24 Q All right. What is radio frequency  
25 cooking?

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

3 UNITHERM FOOD SYSTEMS, INC., )  
4 an Illinois corporation; )  
5 and JENNIE-O-FOODS, INC., )  
6 a Minnesota corporation, )

7 Plaintiffs, )

8 vs. )

9 SWIFT-ECKRICH, INC., d/b/a )  
10 CONAGRA REFRIGERATED FOODS, )  
11 a Delaware corporation, )

12 Defendant. )

**COPY**

No. CIV 01-347-C

13 The Deposition of PREM S. SINGH, called  
14 by the Plaintiffs for examination, taken pursuant to  
15 notice, taken before CARYL L. HARDY, CSR NO.  
16 084-3896, a Notary Public within and for the County  
17 of Cook, State of Illinois, and a Certified Shorthand  
18 Reporter of said state, taken at 33 North Dearborn  
19 Street, Suite 600, Chicago, Illinois, on the 28th day  
20 of November, A.D., 2001, at 9:00 o'clock a.m.

21 VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

22 EXHIBIT K

23 PTO-003267

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 BY MR. BROWN:

2 Q The reporter is handing you what's marked  
3 Deposition Exhibit 1. What is that document?

4 A This is an approved patent.

5 Q I note on the cover of the exhibit in the  
6 left-hand column it says, "Inventor: Prem S. Singh;"  
7 is that correct?

8 A That's correct.

9 Q Is that you?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Did you, in fact, invent the subject  
12 matter claimed in this patent?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Did you invent all of it?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Is there anything discussed in this  
17 patent that you did not invent?

18 A No.

19 Q Can you tell me when you invented the  
20 subject matter claimed in this patent?

21 A You mean when did I file it?

22 Q When did you invent it?

23 A '88, '89.

24 Q Tell me how that came about.

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003268



## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 different. It might be seven, eight feet.

2 Remember, this was a concept. This  
3 is the idea, and so we implemented from that idea,  
4 and so cutting locations might be different. It  
5 could be 90 degrees there, mechanical stuff.

6 This shows here five feet worktable,  
7 for example. It shows the steam valve. It doesn't  
8 connect to the controller. So that might be  
9 different. The 20 GPM pump might be different. It  
10 could be, you know, 40 GPM. It shows 200-gallon tank  
11 there. It could be 150-gallon tank. Those are . .  
12 things, mechanical stuff were different.

13 Q Isn't it true that the Enersyst system  
14 you installed produces the product according to the  
15 process claimed in the patent and it's done so since  
16 the end of 1989?

17 A No. It's not true.

18 Q How is that not true?

19 A This is not golden brown color.

20 Q Is that the only difference?

21 A The LAB value of this product is  
22 different. It's a -- the '027 patent is -- doesn't  
23 have the -- this chiller -- impingement chiller that  
24 shows here.

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003269

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 column 8. And we see claim 1 which begins column 8,  
2 line 4. Let's take a look at that claim and tell me  
3 anything called for in that claim which was not  
4 present in the process as on the Enersyst system  
5 after 1989.

6 (Witness perusing document.)

7 BY THE WITNESS:

8 A Yeah. Regarding claim 1, the browning  
9 liquid here is a pyrolysis product as opposed to '89  
10 process which was the nonpyrolysis product which does  
11 not have capacity to play a Maillard reaction-type  
12 mechanism. So this is a fundamental difference:  
13 Pyrolysis versus this is just the coloring agent.

14 And then develop a golden brown  
15 color is another difference -- substantial difference  
16 from this flow sheet there.

17 Q Isn't it true that some liquid pyrolysis  
18 products are, in fact -- let me restate that.

19 Isn't it true that some caramel  
20 colorings are, in fact, liquid pyrolysis products?

21 A No. When you say caramel color, they're  
22 not liquid pyrolysis product. Caramel color is just  
23 coloring dye basically.

24 Q I refer you to column 4 of your patent at

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 the label that is -- goes with Maillose caramel  
2 coloring or not.

3 Q Maillose is, in fact, a liquid pyrolysis  
4 product, is it not?

5 A Yes.

6 Q What is a pyrolysis product?

7 A It's a heat reactant. So what you're  
8 doing there, you are taking sugar or the base -- in  
9 this case, it could be even wood -- and you're going  
10 through thermal processing and going through a  
11 distillation process. And then you are taking off  
12 from the distillation columns the desirable liquid.  
13 And then ultimately it will give you the browning  
14 characteristic that you are looking for as --

15 Q Are not caramel compounds themselves  
16 formed by heat?

17 A Caramel?

18 Q Yes.

19 A Like I said, the difference is that it's  
20 not a pyrolysis product. It's a coloring agent, so  
21 it does not react the same way as the Maillose will  
22 react. So it's a fundamentally big difference  
23 between just the caramel coloring and Maillose or  
24 pyrolysis product as it's known in industries.

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003271

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1                   MR. BROWN: It is also a speaking  
2                   objection, and those, I believe, are not  
3                   allowed in any district.  
4                   You may answer the question.

5 BY THE WITNESS:

6                   A       I'm not sure I understand naturally  
7                   follow means, but it's a follow. Whether it's  
8                   natural follow or not, I'm not understanding your  
9                   question. Can you explain what that means?

10 BY MR. BROWN:

11                   Q       Wouldn't it be apparent to just about  
12                   anybody in your field given knowledge of this  
13                   Energysyst system that was being used in 1989 that you  
14                   could use Maillose caramel coloring in that system?

15                   A       Not at all. There's a fundamental  
16                   difference in terms of reaction steps involved, the  
17                   mechanism, the reaction kinetics involved. They  
18                   produced completely different kind of by-products in  
19                   the reaction phenomena. There are at least a dozen  
20                   reactions take place that's not present in '88.

21                               So it's not obvious at all. It's  
22                   not naturally follow from that process. For example,  
23                   there's no aldehyde produced in this process.  
24                   There's no aceteldehyde produced from that process.

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003272

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 It's a completely different reaction mechanism and  
2 kinetics.

3 Q Do the claims call for any of that?

4 A Well, claim calls for pyrolysis golden  
5 brown products which are the results of that process.

6 Q So is it now your testimony that your  
7 conception in 1988 did not include the use of a  
8 liquid pyrolysis product?

9 A Ask again, please.

10 Q Is it now your testimony that your  
11 conception in 1988 did not include the use of a  
12 liquid pyrolysis product?

13 A '88 was not a liquid pyrolysis product.

14 Q And it's also your testimony that your  
15 conception in 1988 did not involve the golden  
16 browning of any product?

17 A There was no definition of golden  
18 browning.

19 Q Just so we can confirm, you testified  
20 that the shrinkage obtained or resulting from the use  
21 of the Enersyst system was in the range of from about  
22 2 to 3 percent; is that correct?

23 A That's correct.

24 Q You testified that the inlet temperature

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1           A     Yes.

2           Q     -- at that time?

3           A     Yes.

4           Q     Did your summary include a list of  
5 relevant prior art materials?

6                     MR. SCHROEDER: I object on the  
7 grounds of attorney-client privilege. I  
8 instruct the witness not to answer.

9                     MR. BROWN: Are you objecting to  
10 conversations held, or are you objecting  
11 to this document that was given?

12                    MR. SCHROEDER: Regardless of whether  
13 it was orally or written in this  
14 document, I'm objecting to your asking  
15 the witness about his communications with  
16 the legal department concerning this  
17 invention and the preparation of a patent  
18 application.

19 BY MR. BROWN:

20           Q     More important, Mr. Singh, did you tell  
21 the patent office about this Enersyst system that was  
22 in operation producing product circa 1989?

23           A     It's a conventional process.

24           Q     You did not inform the patent office of

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 solution of caramel coloring with a low pH 2.5  
2 through 3.5, for surface caramel coloring of the  
3 product. The Malloise will be in a 12 percent  
4 solution and heated to 140 degree F."

5 Is this referring to the Wells  
6 process using the Enersyst system?

7 A This may be running a test. Sometimes  
8 when you run a small test, still you have to write  
9 this procedure.

10 Q Is this referring to a test at a pilot  
11 plant? Is that what you're saying?

12 A No. It could be at Wells.

13 Q This was to be done at Wells?

14 A Yes, but this look like a test.

15 Q I notice on the second page it says,  
16 again, "Description of proposed change: Use  
17 Maillose," and repeats what was stated on the earlier  
18 page.

19 Then it says, "Products affected by  
20 name: Skinless Slice and Serve Oven Prepared  
21 caramel, not the mesquite smoked; products affected  
22 by," and then it gives UPC code numbers: UPC  
23 45300-29041, 45300-29048, 45300-29051, and  
24 45300-23274; is that correct?

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003275

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1           A     Yes.

2           Q     The next line says at Wells, Minnesota,  
3     correct?

4           A     Yes.

5           Q     Then under paragraph 6 it says, "Change  
6     affects printed product labels." It says, "Choose  
7     option A, B, or C by marking with an X." And the  
8     item there marked with an X is make change rapidly;  
9     get temporary labels approved.

10                     Is that correct?

11          A     That's correct.

12          Q     Isn't it correct, Mr. Singh, that Armour  
13     Swift-Eckrich actually began using Maillose for the  
14     production of these products?

15          A     No. That's not correct.

16                     (Singh Deposition Exhibit No. 5  
17                     marked for identification, 11-28-01.)

18     BY MR. BROWN:

19          Q     Mr. Singh, we've handed you what is  
20     marked Exhibit Number 5. Do you recognize this  
21     document?

22          A     No. I don't recognize this document.

23          Q     On about the top line it indicates the  
24     fax designation there Swift-Eckrich Wells, and then

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003276



## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 it's got an arrow R and D; is that correct?

2 A Yes.

3 Q Then it refers to a Maillose pH and  
4 concentration check sheet; is that correct?

5 A That's correct.

6 Q And then it has several columns, the  
7 first being a date column. My copy -- I can't read  
8 the last date on the second page, but I can read  
9 dates of 1-3-94, 1-5-94, 1-6-94, 1-7-94, 1-10-94,  
10 1-13-94, and that carries over to the second page; is  
11 that correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And the middle column on this chart  
14 states hours of production; is that correct?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q Doesn't this, in fact, indicate that  
17 Armour Swift-Eckrich was producing product using  
18 Maillose --

19 A No.

20 Q -- in the Enersyst system?

21 A No. This is the check of the pH versus  
22 the Maillose.

23 Q What does hours of production mean?

24 A Just that they ran that so many hours, so

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 that this is a test.

2 Q Doesn't this indicate that this was faxed  
3 from the Wells plant to R and D?

4 A Yes.

5 (Singh Deposition Exhibit No. 6  
6 marked for identification, 11-28-01.)

7 BY MR. BROWN:

8 Q Mr. Singh, we've handed you what's marked  
9 Exhibit 6. Do you recognize this document?

10 A No.

11 Q Is it dated January 26th, 1994, is that  
12 correct, up at the upper right-hand corner?

13 A Correct.

14 Q Who is Mr. Syed Hussain?

15 A He works for Armour Swift-Eckrich.

16 Q Does he report to you?

17 A No.

18 Q Do you report to him?

19 A No.

20 Q Did you at any time?

21 A No.

22 Q What is his position at Armour  
23 Swift-Eckrich?

24 A The current position is that he is

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003278

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 director of process control.

2 Q Do you work in conjunction with him on  
3 projects?

4 A Sometimes.

5 Q Were you working in conjunction with him  
6 on this project?

7 A Which project is it?

8 Q This project indicated in this document.

9 A I don't know what this is.

10 Q So you don't know what these documents  
11 say; is that your testimony?

12 A Well, I can read it. I can tell you what  
13 it is. Do you want me to read it?

14 Q You don't know whether these documents  
15 are saying that Maillose was being used in the  
16 Enersyst system or not; isn't that correct?

17 A Can you allow me to read it before I  
18 answer your question?

19 Q Sure.

20 (Witness perusing document.)

21 BY THE WITNESS:

22 A This seems to be test. They ran some  
23 tests for shelf life evaluation, the color evaluation  
24 internally. And this is a change order to say that

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 effectively not to produce any more test products.

2 BY MR. BROWN:

3 Q Does this say anywhere that this was just  
4 a test?

5 A No, it doesn't, but because the change  
6 form --

7 Q So your answer is no, it doesn't; is that  
8 correct?

9 A It doesn't.

10 MR. SCHROEDER: Let the witness  
11 finish his answer, please.

12 BY MR. BROWN:

13 Q Doesn't it state --

14 MR. SCHROEDER: Wait a minute. The  
15 witness hasn't finished his answer that  
16 he was giving to your previous question.

17 BY THE WITNESS:

18 A It's a test, and the change mean that the  
19 test is done usually. We use a change form. You  
20 require some kind of form to -- even to run the test  
21 product. Otherwise, USDA will not allow you to run  
22 any product even -- because once you go in the  
23 manufacturing plant, you need certain documentation  
24 and approval to run the tests.

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003280

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 BY MR. BROWN:

2 Q In paragraph 1, in a matter similar to  
3 the previous document we viewed, it says, "Description  
4 of proposed change;" is that correct?

5 A The first --

6 Q The paragraph numbered 1.

7 A Yeah, yeah.

8 Q Isn't it true that it states that  
9 proposed change is to stop using Maillose?

10 A It could be -- to stop using Maillose  
11 doesn't mean that -- it could be eight hours run and  
12 they're saying stop using it.

13 Q Referring to paragraph 3, isn't it true  
14 that Maillose was then being used in January 26th,  
15 1994, to produce products UPC 45300-29041, 29048,  
16 29051, and 23274?

17 A Those were the product tested. That's  
18 all it says.

19 MR. BROWN: Could you repeat the  
20 question for him?

21 (Record read.)

22 BY THE WITNESS:

23 A Yes.

24

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003281

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 meeting.

2 Q And what were those meetings about?

3 A It was about several things, I  
4 understood, like sheet metals, vats, helping him to  
5 get business in our company, getting into one of  
6 their plants.

7 And so Arni Mikelberg requested that  
8 we should provide him some business, if we can:  
9 Going to the plant, several plants; seeing if -- if  
10 he can provide us something, you know, like I said,  
11 all kind of sheet metals, drains, vats, racks,  
12 tubes. And then so that was the main purpose.

13 And then second one was that he was  
14 going to send us an oven that we were supposed to  
15 evaluate.

16 Q What type of evaluation were you going to  
17 do on the oven?

18 A To see what can we do with that oven.

19 Q Was there any discussion of whole muscle  
20 meat browning?

21 A No.

22 Q Was there any discussion of any type of  
23 meat browning?

24 A No, not that day anyway.

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003282

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 the oven?

2 A The claim was that that oven will brown  
3 without putting anything on it. That was the main  
4 purpose of me testing that oven. And we spent -- I  
5 don't know -- eight weeks striving to test that  
6 claim, which completely failed.

7 Q Were there any other type of tests  
8 performed on the oven?

9 A Yes.

10 Q What were those?

11 A Liquid smoke and -- that's one. And we  
12 ran some Maillose. And last, when we were shipping  
13 that oven, we connected to that oven a natural smoke  
14 generator and the pipe and temperature control, and  
15 that was tested also.

16 Q Did you tell anyone at Unitherm or  
17 Proctor prior to receiving this oven that you  
18 intended to connect natural smoke to it?

19 A Yes. I did discuss with Howard.

20 Q Did you have any discussions with David  
21 Howard while these tests were being conducted?

22 A I don't remember that we discussed with  
23 him, but Gaydusek, yes.

24 Q How long did the tests last?

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1                   We have a -- right now we have  
2     equipment where we are testing it may take four or  
3     five months because it's not just plug it in, run the  
4     product, then you're done. Then you have to evaluate  
5     the products chemically, you know, microbiologically,  
6     sensory. So it's not just looking the oven and just  
7     run the test. It's not atypical to run the test for  
8     four or five months.

9                 Q     What were the results of these tests?

10                A     It was complete failure from the  
11     objective that was described to us.

12                Q     And what objective was that?

13                A     That you can brown the product without  
14     any coating on it.

15                Q     What about the other tests that you  
16     conducted? What were the results?

17                A     Well, the natural smoke that we hooked up  
18     in there, that produced somewhat acceptable product.

19                Q     What about the liquid smoke Maillose  
20     tests?

21                A     It was somewhat, again, successful.

22                Q     Were any evaluations done of the product  
23     produced using liquid smoke and/or Maillose?

24                A     Say it again.

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003284



## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 BY THE WITNESS:

2 A No, I don't.

3 BY MR. BROWN:

4 Q He then says, "We have a question mark on  
5 the marketability of it and value your input." Isn't  
6 he, in fact, saying that Unitherm developed the  
7 process and he would like Armour Swift-Eckrich's  
8 input on the marketability of the process?

9 MR. SCHROEDER: Objection; calls for  
10 speculation.

11 BY MR. BROWN:

12 Q Isn't that true?

13 A I don't know what it says.

14 Q It speaks of the trials. You mentioned  
15 these earlier. "The objectives of the trials are as  
16 follows: Unitherm will supply 2 zone Rapidflow for a  
17 two-week period; Unitherm seek to prove uniform  
18 smoking in less than ten minutes; the shrink should  
19 be 1 to 3 percent; the color should match or better  
20 your existing product."

21 Is this your understanding of the  
22 trials that were to be done on the Unitherm oven?

23 A No.

24 Q Isn't this, in fact, the process claimed

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 in at least claim 1 of the '027 patent?

2 A No.

3 Q Item number 7 says, "Unitherm will  
4 license Armour Swift-Eckrich with the process for  
5 50 percent of the return on investment exclusively."

6 Did anyone ever discuss that offer with you?

7 A No.

8 Q Did you ever hear of it?

9 A No.

10 (Singh Deposition Exhibit No. 25  
11 marked for identification, 11-28-01.)

12 BY MR. BROWN:

13 Q We've handed you what's marked  
14 Exhibit 25. I notice that it is addressed to you.  
15 What is this document?

16 A I don't recall this document, but it  
17 shows that criteria for the trial it reads.

18 Q Item number 1 calls for liquid smoke  
19 application for turkey breasts; dwell time 7.5  
20 minutes at 330 degrees C; internal temperature will  
21 rise by 1 degree C; 1 percent shrinkage.

22 Isn't this, in fact, the process  
23 claimed in the '027 patent?

24 A Completely not. What kind of liquid

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 "The following is the price for the linear smoking  
2 process line." Isn't it true that this is the --  
3 this linear smoking process line is for practicing  
4 the process as claimed in the '027 patent?

5 A No.

6 Q What process is it for?

7 A This is the process that we were testing  
8 for completely different purpose to duplicate natural  
9 smoke to these products.

10 Q Does this process brown the product?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Doesn't this process, in fact, produce a  
13 golden brown color?

14 A That I don't know. My guess is not. It  
15 will not produce.

16 Q That is your guess. Your testimony is  
17 you don't know?

18 A That's correct, because there's not  
19 enough information here to determine that.

20 Q Did you have any discussions with  
21 Mr. Howard concerning this line?

22 A Yes.

23 Q What was discussed?

24 A Price, delivery. We do that normally all

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 doesn't mean that, you know, I've not read it. I  
2 just don't recall it.

3 Q Did you attend the International Poultry  
4 Exposition in Atlanta, the 22nd and the 24th of that  
5 month of that year?

6 A I don't remember. 1997, I don't know.

7 Q It states in the second paragraph, "Among  
8 our various exhibits, we will be showing the first  
9 inline browning/smoking system for deli turkey/crowns  
10 and hams. The product shrinkage using this system is  
11 only 2 and a half percent and results are achieved  
12 with a smoke time of ten minutes."

13 Isn't this, in fact, discussing the  
14 process claimed in the '027 patent?

15 A I don't know what it's saying. It's only  
16 saying the shrinkage is 2 and a half percent. The  
17 results are achievable.

18 Q Isn't it true that Mr. Howard told you  
19 that this was a line which had, in fact, been  
20 constructed and had already been sold to Plantation  
21 Foods for practicing the turkey browning process  
22 claimed in the '027 patent?

23 A That's not true.

24 Q Now claimed in the '027 patent?

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1           A     Not true.

2           Q     Did you contact Mr. Howard or anyone else  
3     at Unitherm concerning the showing of this inline  
4     browning/smoking system?

5           A     No.

6           Q     You never told him to stop?

7           A     Stop what?

8           Q     Not show it.

9           A     No, no.

10          Q     Did you tell him that this was your  
11     process?

12          A     No.

13          Q     Did you discuss this with anyone?

14          A     No.

15                     (Singh Deposition Exhibit No. 32  
16                     marked for identification, 11-28-01.)

17     BY MR. BROWN:

18          Q     This is Exhibit 32. This is a letter  
19     from David Howard dated April 21st, 1997, to -- how  
20     does Mr. -- how does he pronounce that?

21          A     Des Lauriers.

22          Q     Des Lauriers?

23          A     Yes.

24          Q     Have you ever seen this document?

## DEPOSITION OF PREM S. SINGH -- 11/28/01

1 conducted in the pilot plant on Maillose treated  
2 turkey breasts. Jim Costelloe's first priority has  
3 been to develop a consistent golden brown color."

4 Isn't it true that until  
5 January 12th, 1998, you had not been able to develop  
6 a consistent golden brown color?

7 A The golden brown if you say, that's  
8 correct, not consistently.

9 (Singh Deposition Exhibit No. 35  
10 marked for identification, 11-28-01.).

11 BY MR. BROWN:

12 Q This is Exhibit 35. It's a letter from  
13 David Howard to you and Chris Salm dated April 27th,  
14 1998. Do you recall this document?

15 A I don't recall, but this -- if it was  
16 sent to me, it should be in my file. I don't recall  
17 specifically.

18 Q Isn't it true that David Howard told you  
19 that Unitherm sold systems for practicing the process  
20 now claimed in the '027 patent to Plantation Foods  
21 and to House of Raeford?

22 A No.

23 MR. CASTRO: Why don't we go off the  
24 record for a few minutes? We may be

VICTORIA COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC. (312) 443-1025

PTO-003290